arXiv:hep-th/9903103v1 11 Mar 1999

HIP-1999-11/TH
March, 1999

On Different Criteria for Confinement

Masud Chaichian and **Tatsuo Kobayashi**

Department of Physics, High Energy Physics Division
University of Helsinki
and
Helsinki Institute of Physics
P.O. Box 9 (Siltavuorenpenger 20 C), FIN-00014 Helsinki, Finland

(March 11, 1999)

Abstract

We compare two approaches in supersymmetric confinement, the Seiberg formulation and the superconvergence rule. For the latter, the critical point is $\gamma_{00} = 0$ in the Landau gauge. We find $4\gamma_{00} = \beta_0$ is the critical point for most of confining theories without a tree-level superpotential in the Seiberg formulation, in particular, in the large N_c and N_f limit. We show how confining theories with a discrete symmetry and a tree-level superpotential connect these two critical points: the large and small discrete symmetry limits correspond to the critical points $4\gamma_{00} = \beta_0$ and $\gamma_{00} = 0$, respectively.

1 Introduction

There are many approaches to probe confinement, the Nishijima and Oehme-Zimmermann (NOZ) approach, lattice calculations, the Schwinger-Dyson equations, the recent Seiberg formulation, etc. However, relations between different approaches are not clear. Indeed, the definition and implication of confinement in these approaches differ from each other. It is important to compare different approaches in order to understand possible relations among them. To this end, we compare two approaches, the Seiberg and the NOZ approaches.

In the NOZ approach, the superconvergence rule for the gluon propagator has been investigated [1, 2, 3] and the approach is related with the Kugo-Ojima confinement mechanism [4]. The superconvergence for the gluon propagator is realized if $Z_3^{-1} = 0$, where Z_3 is the renormalization constant of the gluon wave function. In this sense confinement, as well as other nontrivial aspects, implies the behavior that some of the renormalization constants, Z_i or Z_i^{-1} should vanish. In this approach the renormalization group (RG) equations play an important role. Its discussion is applicable in the weak coupling region and one-loop RG equations are reliable. In the Landau gauge $\alpha = 0$, we have $Z_3^{-1} = 0$, which implies the superconvergence, only if $\beta_0 < 0$ and $\gamma_{00} < 0$, where β_0 and γ_{00} are the one-loop β-function coefficient of the gauge coupling g and the one-loop anomalous dimension coefficient of the gluon field, respectively. The NOZ approach is model-independent. The condition for the superconvergence is applicable for gauge theories with any gauge groups and any matter fields. Also it is applicable for both non-supersymmetric and supersymmetric theories [5]. Only the β-function and the anomalous dimension are the decisive quantities.

On the other hand, in the Seiberg formulation, holomorphy and global symmetries including R-symmetries play an essential role [6, 7]. By use of the power of symmetries, one can discuss nonperturbative aspects of supersymmetric gauge theories in the strong coupling region. In this formulation confinement implies the description of the infrared effective theory in terms of gauge invariant operators on the moduli spaces. The formulation is theory-dependent, i.e. the analyses depend on global symmetries of theories. Several types of confining theories without a tree-level superpotential [8], i.e. the theories with non-vanishing superpotential (s-confinement) [9], the theories with vanishing superpotential and quantum deformed moduli space, the theories with vanishing superpotential and an affine moduli space [10], have been found. Furthermore, the confining theories with quantum deformed moduli space are classified into two types: in one type the quantum deformed constraint is invariant under the global symmetry (i-confinement) and in the other the constraint is covariant (c-confinement) [11]. In addition, recently several s-confining theories with a tree-level superpotential have also been found [12, 13, 14].

In order to compare the two approaches mentioned above, it is useful to write a generic confinement condition in the Seiberg formulation in terms of γ_{00} and β_0 and study its implications in RG equations.

Recently, Csáki *et al.* have obtained a generic viewpoint in the Seiberg approach [9]. They have derived necessary conditions for the s-, i- and c-confining theories, which are written in terms of Dynkin indices of matter fields. We investigate the confinement condition following Ref.[9] and describe it in terms of γ_{00} and β_0. Similarly, we investigate confining theories with a tree-level superpotential. Then, we compare the superconvergence rule and the implications of Seiberg's confinement and present a conjecture which would fill the gap between them.

2 Superconvergence rule

First we review briefly the superconvergence rule. We begin with the renormalization constants for the gluon field, $A_\mu^{(0)} = Z_3^{1/2} A_\mu$, $\Gamma_{3A}^{(0)} = Z_1 \Gamma_{3A}$ and $g^{(0)} = Z_g g$, where A_μ is the gluon field and Γ_{3A} is the three-gluon vertex. Here the $A_\mu^{(0)}$ denotes the unrenormalized gluon field and the superscript (0) in $\Gamma_{3A}^{(0)}$ and $g^{(0)}$ means the same. Obviously, we have the relation $Z_g = Z_1 Z_3^{-3/2}$. The RG equations for these renormalization constants are written as $dZ_3^{-1}/d\rho = -2\gamma Z_3^{-1}$ and $dZ_g^{-1}/d\rho = (\beta/g) Z_g^{-1}$, where β and γ are the β-function of g and the anomalous dimension of the gluon field. Here we restrict ourselves to the Landau gauge $\alpha = 0$ [15]. The β-function and the anomalous dimension are expanded as,

$$\beta(g) = g^3(\beta_0 + \beta_1 g^2 + \cdots), \tag{1}$$

$$\gamma(g) = g^2(\gamma_{00} + \gamma_{10} g^2 + \cdots). \tag{2}$$

In the Landau gauge, the gluon propagator is given by

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\mu\nu}(k) &= \left(g_{\mu\nu} - \frac{k_\mu k_\nu}{k^2 - i\varepsilon}\right) D(k^2), \qquad (3) \\ D(k^2) &= \int dm^2 \frac{\rho(m^2)}{k^2 - m^2 - i\varepsilon}, \qquad (4) \end{aligned}$$

where $\rho(m^2)$ is the spectral function. $D(k^2)$ follows the same RG equation as Z_3^{-1} and we have $Z_3^{-1} = \int dm^2 \rho(m^2)$. Therefore, if $Z_3^{-1} = 0$, then we have the superconvergence sum rule, $\int dm^2 \rho(m^2) = 0$.

Now let us calculate Z_3^{-1} and $\int dm^2 \rho(m^2)$. We are interested in the asymptotic free theory, i.e. $\beta < 0$, and we consider the weak coupling region where the one-loop RG equations are reliable. In this case, we use the RG equations to calculate Z_3^{-1} as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} Z_3^{-1} &= \exp\left(\int_0^\infty d\rho 2\gamma\right), \\ &= \exp\left(\int_{g(0)}^{g_\infty} dg \beta_g^{-1} 2\gamma\right), \\ &= (g_\infty / g(0))^{2\gamma_{00}/\beta_0}, \qquad (5) \end{aligned}$$

where $g(0)$ is a nonvanishing finite value at $\rho = 0$. Because of the asymptotic freedom, we have the behavior $g_\infty \to 0$ in the limit $\rho \to \infty$. Hence, we have $Z_3^{-1} = \int dm^2 \rho(m^2) = 0$ if $\gamma_{00} < 0$. Thus, the critical point for the superconvergence is

$$\gamma_{00} = 0. \qquad (6)$$

In the NOZ approach it is important to investigate the behavior of the renormalization constants, i.e. to calculate Z_i or Z_i^{-1} and investigate critical points of these values. On the other hand, Kugo conjectured that $Z_1 Z_3^{-1} = 0$ is a sufficient condition for the color confinement [17].

Note that the NOZ approach is generic and the superconvergence rule is applicable for both supersymmetric and non-supersymmetric gauge theories with any gauge group and matter fields in any representations. Furthermore, the approach focuses on the weak coupling region implying that one could derive nontrivial results even from knowledge at the weak coupling region.

3 The Seiberg confinement

In the Seiberg formulation, the probe of confining theories implies investigation of the superpotential of gauge invariants together with their moduli space and constraints. Several types of confining theories have been found [8], s-confinement [9], i-confinement, c-confinement [11] and affine confinement [10].

For example, in the supersymmetric QCD with the gauge group $SU(N_c)$ and N_f flavors of quark pairs, the case with $N_f = N_c$ corresponds to the i-confinement, while the $N_f = N_c + 1$ case corresponds to the s-confinement. In the supersymmetric QCD, the flavor number $N_f = N_c + 1$ is a critical point. For a larger flavor $N_f > N_c + 1$ we do not have confinement.

In Ref.[9] necessary conditions for the s-, i- and c-confinements have been derived without the presence of a tree-level superpotential. Let us consider the supersymmetric gauge theory with the gauge group G and N chiral matter multiplets Φ_i $(i = 1, \cdots, N)$. We define N R-symmetries $U(1)_{Ri}$ $(i = 1, \cdots, N)$ such that for the i-th R-symmetry $U(1)_{Ri}$ all chiral matter fields except the i-th chiral multiplet Φ_i have vanishing R-charges and Φ_i has the R-charge q_i. These R-symmetries should have vanishing gauge anomaly. Thus, we fix the R-charge $q_i = \Delta/\mu_i$, where

$$\Delta \equiv \sum_{j=1}^{N} \mu_j - \mu_G, \tag{7}$$

and μ_i is the Dynkin index for the gauge representation of Φ_i and μ_G is the index of the adjoint representation. Here we follow the normalization used in Ref.[9], where for instance the fundamental representations of the $SU(N)$ group have the Dynkin index $\mu_{fund} = 1$.

The superpotential should have the R-charge 2 for $U(1)_{Ri}$. Hence, the superpotential must be a combination of terms of the form $\Lambda^3 \prod(\Phi_i/\Lambda)^{2\mu_i/\Delta}$, where Λ is the dynamical scale. For the s-confinement we must have the smooth superpotential, i.e. the exponents of Φ_i $(i = 1, \cdots, N)$ should be positive integers. This implies $\Delta = 2$ or 1. Only the former one is available in the present normalization [9], i.e.

$$\Delta = 2 \quad \text{for} \quad \mathrm{s-confinement}. \tag{8}$$

Similarly, we can discuss the i- or c-confinement, where we have the vanishing superpotential. We have the condition,

$$\Delta = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad \text{i}- \text{ and c} - \text{confinement}. \tag{9}$$

Eqs. (8) and (9) are the necessary conditions for the s-confinement and i- and c-confinement, respectively. Indeed, in the supersymmetric QCD we find $\Delta = 2$ for $N_f = N_c + 1$ and $\Delta = 0$ for $N_f = N_c$.

Here we study implications of the conditions (8) and (9) from the viewpoint of the NOZ approach. We consider the weak coupling region where the one-loop RG equations are reliable. We describe the conditions (8) and (9) in the plane (β_0, γ_{00}). In supersymmetric gauge theory, β_0 and γ_{00} are obtained as

$$\begin{aligned} (16\pi^2)2\beta_0 &= -3\mu_G + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mu_i = -2\mu_G + \Delta, & (10) \\ (16\pi^2)2\gamma_{00} &= -\frac{3}{2}\mu_G + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mu_i = -\frac{1}{2}\mu_G + \Delta. & (11) \end{aligned}$$

Here we use eq. (9), so that we find the relation between β_0 and γ_{00},

$$4\gamma_{00} = \beta_0, \tag{12}$$

for the i- and c-confinement. We have $4\gamma_{00} = \beta_0 + 3/(16\pi^2)$ for the s-confinement. In the large μ_G limit, e.g. the large N_c limit of the gauge group $SU(N_c)$, it becomes eq.(12). The large μ_G limit also implies the large flavor number limit through eqs.(8) and (9).

In the affine confining theories [11], the universal index constraint is no longer applicable. However, in the large μ_G limit the relation (12) is realized for the theories explicitly obtained in Ref.[11] [18]. Furthermore, the other type of confining theory has been found, i.e. the $SO(N)$ gauge theory with $(N-3)$ vectors [20]. This theory is not classified into any type of the above. This theory has $2\sum_j \mu_j < \mu_G$ and $2\sum_j \mu_j = \mu_G$ in the large N limit. Hence, in such limit we have $5/2\gamma_{00} = \beta_0$.

As a result eq. (12) in the (β_0, γ_{00}) plane is significant for most of the Seiberg type of confining theories, in particular i- and c- confinement and s- and affine confinement for large μ_G. It is different from the critical point of the superconvergence (6). By performing calculations similar to eq.(5), we find that eq.(12) is the critical point for the value $Z_1^{-1}Z_3^{-1/2}$, i.e. $Z_1^{-1}Z_3^{-1/2} =$

0 if $4\gamma_{00} < \beta_0$. Similarly, Z_1^{-1} vanishes if $3\gamma_{00} < \beta_0$. These regions require less matter fields than $\gamma_{00} < 0$. Therefore, the single condition $Z_3^{-1} = 0$ appears not to be sufficient for the Seiberg type of supersymmetric confining theories.

Before we consider the gap between eqs.(12) and (6) through investigation of a tree-level superpotential, we give a comment on a recent lattice calculation [21], which shows that there is a confinement phase for the non-supersymmetric QCD with the gauge group $SU(3)$ and 6 or less flavors of quark pairs. Amusingly, this coincides with the region with $3\gamma_{00} < \beta_0$ for the non-supersymmetric case.

Up to now, we have considered confining theories without a tree-level superpotential. In particular, eq.(12) is significant for the i- and c- confinement and s- and affine confinement for large μ_G. Now we discuss confining theories with a tree-level superpotential. Such a consideration is suggestive for understanding the origin of the gap between eq.(12) and eq.(6) as we shall see.

Recently, several s-confining theories with a tree-level superpotential have been discussed [12, 13, 14]. These new s-confining theories are shown in Table 1. They have N_f flavors of fundamental pairs for the gauge groups $SU(N_c)$ and $Sp(2N_c)$ and N_f flavors of vector representations for the gauge group $SO(N_c)$. In addition, they contain additional tensors and the tensors have a tree-level superpotential. The presence of a tree-level superpotential breaks explicitly some of $U(1)$ symmetries which play an essential role in the index constraint. Thus, neither eq.(8) nor (9) holds. Instead, these theories possess discrete symmetries which are shown in Table 1.

For example, let us take the second theory in Table 1, which has the gauge group $SU(N_c)$, N_f flavors of quark pairs, an additional antisymmetric tensor multiplet and its conjugate X and $\bar{X}$, and the tree-level superpotential $W_{\text{tree}} = \text{Tr}(X\bar{X})^{k+1}$ [13]. This theory has the discrete symmetry $Z_{2(k+1)N_f}$. If $N_c = (2k+1)N_f - 4k - 1$, s-confinement is realized. The theory with one flavor less has a quantum modified moduli space. In the second s-confining theory we have $\Delta = 2(N_f - 2)$ and $\mu_G = 2(2k+1)N_f - 8k - 2$ as shown in Table 1. As the discrete symmetry becomes large, i.e. k increases, the relation between γ_{00} and β_0 becomes close to eq.(12). On the other hand, as the discrete symmetry becomes small, the ratio β_0/γ_{00} increases. To simplify the discussion, here we take the large N_f limit as we did previously. We denote the discrete symmetry as $Z_{(m+1)N_f}$. In this case, we have

$$\Delta = 2N_f, \qquad \mu_G = 2mN_f. \tag{13}$$

Indeed these relations in the large N_f limit always hold in any s-confining theory with the discrete symmetry $Z_{(m+1)(N_f+\ell)}$ among the theories shown in Table 1. Thus, we can obtain a common relation,

$$\frac{\beta_0}{\gamma_{00}} = \frac{-4m+2}{-m+2}, \tag{14}$$

for the large N_f limit. As the discrete symmetry and m become small, the ratio β_0/γ_{00} becomes large, i.e. γ_{00} approaches the point $\gamma_{00} = 0$ from the negative side for β_0 fixed. Actually for $m = 2$ we have $\gamma_{00} = 0$, which is the critical point for the superconvergence rule (6). Note that the discrete symmetry corresponding to $m = 1$ is realized only for the first, sixth and eighth theories in Table 1, but in this case the superpotential corresponds to a mass term of X. After integrating out the heavy mode X, we are left with no superpotential. Thus, $m = 2$ is the minimum value. On the other hand, as the discrete symmetry and m become large, the ratio approaches the value $\beta_0/\gamma_{00} = 4$. The relation (12) is realized at the limit $Z_{(m+1)N_f} \to Z_\infty$. This aspect is quite suggestive and seems to be of significance. We have shown that there is indeed a gap for the critical values of (γ_{00}, β_0) between the superconvergence rule and the Seiberg type of confining theories without a tree-level superpotential. The former critical point is $\gamma_{00} = 0$, while the latter one is $4\gamma_{00} = \beta_0$. However, the above theories with a superpotential and the discrete symmetry $Z_{(m+1)N_f}$ provide with a bridge over the gap. The small and the large $Z_{(m+1)N_f}$ limits correspond to $\gamma_{00} = 0$ and $4\gamma_{00} = \beta_0$, respectively. That would imply that below $\gamma_{00} = 0$ confinement could, in principle, happen, but large global symmetries prevent its occurrence. Thus, in order to find out what else, besides the superconvergence rule, is needed, specific types of global symmetries should be further investigated. This would provide with a physical understanding of the relation between the different approaches to confinement.

4 Conclusion

We have studied the supersymmetric confining theories already obtained in the Seiberg formulation from the NOZ viewpoint. We have described the confinement conditions in terms of β_0 and γ_{00}. The region around $4\gamma_{00} = \beta_0$ seems to be significant. The single condition $\gamma_{00} < 0$, i.e. $Z_3^{-1} = 0$ is not sufficient for the Seiberg type of supersymmetric confining theories. There is a gap between the critical points for the Seiberg type of supersymmetric confining theories and the superconvergence rule, i.e. $4\gamma_{00} = \beta_0$ and $\gamma_{00} = 0$.

We have also considered confining theories with the discrete symmetry $Z_{(m+1)N_f}$ and a tree-level superpotential. In this type of theories, the ratio β_0/γ_{00} is close to 4 for large m and the ratio increases as m decreases. Thus, the large discrete symmetry $Z_{(m+1)N_f}$ corresponds to the critical point $4\gamma_{00} = \beta_0$ and the small discrete symmetry corresponds to the critical point for the superconvergence rule $\gamma_{00} = 0$. This strongly suggests that what makes the gap between $4\gamma_{00} = \beta_0$ and $\gamma_{00} = 0$ is the existence of global symmetry.

Here we have considered the confining theories with the discrete symmetry $Z_{(m+1)N_f}$ and a tree-level superpotential, which have been previously obtained. Although we have derived the common relation (14) from the consideration of explicit theories of Table 1, we are inclined to suggest that this relation could hold in general. Therefore, it is of importance to extend further the analyses to more general types of theories with discrete symmetries.

Acknowledgments

The authors are very grateful to Kazuhiko Nishijima for various enlightening discussions and valuable remarks. This work was supported by the Academy of Finland under Project no. 44129.

References

[1] K. Nishijima, Prog. Theor. Phys. **75** (1986) 1221; Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A9** (1994) 3799; *ibid* **A10** (1995) 3155.

[2] R. Oehme and W. Zimmermann, Phys. Rev. **21** (1980) 471, 1661; R. Oehme, Phys. Lett. **B155** (1987) 60; Phys. Rev. **42** (1990).

[3] For review see e.g.
K. Nishijima, Czech. J. Phys. **46** (1996) 1;
R. Oehme, EFI 95-45, hep-th/9511014 and references therein.

[4] T. Kugo and I. Ojima, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **66** (1979) 1.

[5] R. Oehme, Phys. Lett. **B399** (1997) 67.

[6] N. Seiberg, Phys. Rev. **D49** (1994) 6857; Nucl. Phys. **B435** (1995) 129.

[7] For a review see, e.g.
K. Intriligator and N.Seiberg, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **45BC** (1996) 1.

[8] For review see e.g.
C. Csási, LBNL-42126, hep-th/9807222;
K. Intriligator, hep-th/9811310;
M. Chaichain, W.-F. Chen and C. Montonen, Helsinki Institute of Physics preprint, to appear in Phys. Rep. and references therein.

[9] C. Csáki, M. Schmaltz and W. Skiba, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78** (1997) 799; Phys. Rev. **55** (1997) 7840.

[10] G. Dotti and A.V. Manohar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80** (1998) 2758;
G. Dotti, A.V. Manohar and W. Skiba, Nucl. Phys. **B531** (1998) 507.

[11] B. Grinstein and D.R. Nolte, Phys. Rev. **57** (1998) 6471; *ibid* **58** (1998) 045012.

[12] D. Kutasov, A. Schwimmer and N. Seiberg, Nucl. Phys. **B459** (1996) 567.

[13] C. Csási and H. Murayama, LBNL-42332, hep-th/9810014;
M. Klein, FTUAM-98/29, hep-th/9812155.

[14] T. Hirayama and K. Yoshioka, KUNS-1544, hep-th/9811119.

[15] Other gauges have been considered in Ref.[16] with no significant differences for our further analysis, which can be performed in a similar way.

[16] R. Oehme and W. Xu, Phys. Lett. **B399** (1994) 172.

[17] T. Kugo, Talk given at International Symposium on BRS Symmetry, Sept. 18-22, 1995, Kyoto, KUNS-1368, hep-th/9511033.

[18] For some of affine confining theories, the confinement is realized only for certain gauge groups, but we can not take the large μ_G limit. For them, the above statement does not hold. In particular, one unique theory among them is the $SU(2)$ gauge theory with one chiral multiplet in the spin 3/2 representation of $SU(2)$ [19]. It has the positive γ_{00} and thus the condition $\gamma_{00} < 0$ is not even satisfied.

[19] K. Intriligator, N, Seiberg and S. Shenker, Phys. Lett. **B342** (1995) 152.

[20] K. Intriligator and N, Seiberg, Nucl. Phys. **B444** (1995) 125.

[21] Y. Iwasaki, K. Kanaya, S. Kaya and S. Sakai and T. Yoshié, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **53** (1997) 449; hep-lat/9804005.

	1	2	3	4
Gauge group	$SU(N_c)$	$SU(N_c)$	$SU(N_c)$	$SU(N_c)$
tensors X $(\bar{X})$	adj.	asym. + $\overline{\text{asym.}}$	sym. + $\overline{\text{sym.}}$	asym. + $\overline{\text{sym.}}$
W_{tree}	X^{k+1}	$(X\bar{X})^{k+1}$	$(X\bar{X})^{k+1}$	$(X\bar{X})^{2(k+1)}$
discrete symmetry	$Z_{(k+1)N_f}$	$Z_{2(k+1)N_f}$	$Z_{2(k+1)N_f}$	$Z_{4(k+1)(N_f+4)}$
Δ	$2N_f$	$2(N_f-2)$	$2(N_f+4)$	$2(N_f+5)$
$\mu_G/2$	(kN_f-1)	$(2k+1)N_f-4k-1$	$(2k+1)N_f+4k-1$	$(4k+3)(N_f+4)-1$

	5	6	7	8
Gauge group	$Sp(2N_c)$	$Sp(2N_c)$	$SO(N_c)$	$SO(N_c)$
tensors X	adj.	asym.	adj.	sym.
W_{tree}	$X^{2(k+1)}$	X^{k+1}	$X^{2(k+1)}$	X^{k+1}
discrete symmetry	$Z_{2(k+1)N_f}$	$Z_{(k+1)N_f}$	$Z_{2(k+1)N_f}$	$Z_{(k+1)N_f}$
Δ	$2N_f$	$2(N_f+2)$	$2N_f$	$2(N_f+6)$
$\mu_G/2$	$(2k+1)N_f-2$	$k(N_f-2)$	$(2k+1)N_f+1$	$k(N_f+4)-3$

Table 1: Confining theories with a tree-level superpotential. Additional tensors are shown in the third row, where "sym." and "asym." denote symmetric and antisymmetric representations, respectively, while "$\overline{\text{sym.}}$" and "$\overline{\text{asym.}}$" denote their conjugates. N_f denotes the flavor number of fundamental multiplets and its conjugates for $SU(N_c)$ and $Sp(2N_c)$, and vector multiplets for $SO(N_c)$.